
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

BRETT TALIAFERRO,

Movant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:23-CV-125

**ORDER ADOPTING THE MAGISTRATE
JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Movant Brett Taliaferro, a federal prisoner, proceeding *pro se*, filed this Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255.

The court referred this matter to the Honorable Christine L. Stetson, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of this court. On July 29, 2024, the magistrate judge recommended denying the Motion. To date, the parties have not filed objections to the Report and Recommendation.

The court received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to such referral, along with the record, pleadings and all available evidence. After careful review, the court finds that the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the United States Magistrate Judge are correct.

ORDER

Accordingly, the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct, and the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (#2) is

ADOPTED. A final judgment will be entered in this case in accordance with the magistrate judge's recommendation.

Furthermore, Movant is not entitled to the issuance of a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying federal habeas corpus relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253; FED. R. APP. P. 22(b). The standard for granting a certificate of appealability, like that for granting a certificate of probable cause to appeal under prior law, requires the movant to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004); *see also Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1982). In making that substantial showing, the movant need not establish that he should prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84; *Avila v. Quarterman*, 560 F.3d 299, 304 (5th Cir. 2009). If the motion was denied on procedural grounds, the movant must show that jurists of reason would find it debatable: (1) whether the motion raises a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and (2) whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484; *Elizalde*, 362 F.3d at 328. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability is resolved in favor of the movant, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir. 2000).

Movant has not shown that any of the issues raised by his claims are subject to debate among jurists of reason, or that a procedural ruling is incorrect. In addition, the questions

presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Thus, Movant has failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of a certification of appealability.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 26th day of August, 2024.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Marcia A. Crone".

MARCIA A. CRONE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE